

### **Remarks**

Applicant has reviewed the Office Action dated as mailed September 26, 2008 and the documents cited therewith. After the above amendments have been made, the present application contains claims 1, 11, 13 – 16, and 20 – 22. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 1 and 15 were objected to for various informalities. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to correct the informalities. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 1 and 15 is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1, 11, and 13 – 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohrer et al., U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0088520 in view of Kohane et al., U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/0199765. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 recites:

“defining the content object to include the unrestricted portion of the object content in a mark-up language and a link to the restricted or personal information...”

The Office Action on page 6 admits that Bohrer does not teach defining the content object to include the unrestricted portion of the object content in a mark-up language and a link to the restricted or personal information. Paragraph [0103] of Kohane was cited for teaching these features of claim 1. Paragraph [0103] of Kohane recites:

“[0103] For example, the record owner can place personal identification information within one record object, and the medical information within another record object. Then the record owner can give the agent falling within the “other” role a privilege to read the record object having the medical information, but grants no privileges to the record object with the personal identification information. Consequently, when the research institution accesses the record of the record owner, the gateway service system 22 parses through the associated directory file and skips over those record objects for which the research institute is unauthorized.”

Thus, Kohane merely teaches placing personal identification information in one record object and medical information in another record object. Applicant respectfully submits that Kohane

does not teach or suggest a content object that includes both the unrestricted portion of the content object and a link to the restricted or personal information as provided by the embodiment of the present invention as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is respectfully submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Bohrer and Kohane, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claim 11 and 13 – 14, these claims depend directly from independent claim 1, and by virtue of this dependency, include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, these claims are also respectfully submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Bohrer and Kohane for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 11 and 13 – 14 is respectfully solicited.

Claims 15 – 16 and 20 – 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohrer in view of Fahlman et al., U.S. Patent 5,960,080 and further in view of Kohane. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 15 has been amended to recite:

“collecting a content object responsive to a request by a collection function on a server, wherein the content object includes an unrestricted portion and a link to restricted personal identification information of an author of the unrestricted portion wherein the content object is stored in a federated content repository and the restricted personal identification information of the author of the unrestricted portion of the content object is stored in a separate storage device from the federated content repository...” (emphasis added)

Accordingly, claim 15 has been amended to recited similar features to claim 1. As discussed with respect to claim 1, neither Bohrer nor Kohane teach or suggest that the content object includes an unrestricted portion and a link to restricted personal identification information of an author of the unrestricted portion as provided by amended claim 15. Fahlman was cited for teaching replacing sensitive information with tokens. Applicant respectfully submits that Fahlman adds nothing to the teachings of Bohrer and Kohane so as to render independent claim 15 unpatentable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 15 is respectfully requested.

With regard to claims 16 and 20 – 22, these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 15. Because of this dependency, these claims include all of the features of independent claim 15. Therefore, claims 16, and 20 – 22 are also submitted to be patentably

distinguishable over Bohrer, Fahlman and Kohane, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of these claims is respectfully solicited.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims in the present application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims at the earliest possible date are respectfully requested.

If the Examiner wishes to discuss any aspect of this amendment, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 09-9434.

Respectfully submitted,

Fonda J. Daniels, et al.  
(Applicant)

Date: December 1, 2008

By: Charles L. Moore  
Charles L. Moore  
Registration No. 33,742  
Moore & Van Allen, PLLC  
430 Davis Drive  
Suite 500  
Morrisville, N.C. 27560  
Telephone: (919) 286-8000  
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199